



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/825,345	04/15/2004	Shannon V. Davidson	064747.1011	8660
5073	7590	04/17/2009	EXAMINER	
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.			DAFTUAR, SAKET K	
2001 ROSS AVENUE				
SUITE 600			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
DALLAS, TX 75201-2980			2451	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/17/2009	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptomail1@bakerbotts.com  
glenda.orrantia@bakerbotts.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/825,345	<b>Applicant(s)</b> DAVIDSON ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> SAKET K. DAFTUAR	<b>Art Unit</b> 2451	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>03/19/09</u> .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

***Response to Amendment***

1. This office action is responsive to the amendment filed on January 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2009.

Claims 1-45 are presented for the further examination.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed on January 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2009 have been fully considered with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-45 under 35 USC 103 (a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made further in view of Marsh et al. US Patent Number 7,055,148 B2 (hereinafter Marsh).

***Specification***

3. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Amended claims 16-30 now recites "one or more computer-readable tangible media embodying software the disclosure failed to define "computer-readable tangible media".

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Art Unit: 2451

3. Claims 1-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Amended claims 1-15 now recites " a method comprising: selecting...application, retrieving a policy..., dynamically selecting one of plurality of nodes, resetting a boot image of the selected node..., associating a virtual disk image with selected the node..., and executing at least a portion of the distributed application...on the selected node." Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention. While the claims recite a series of steps or acts to be performed, a statutory "process" under 35 U.S.C. 101 must (1) be tied to particular machine, or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or material) to a different state or thing. See page 10 of *In Re Bilski* 88 USPQ2d 1385. The instant claims are neither positively tied to a particular machine that accomplishes the claimed method steps nor transform underlying subject matter, and therefore do not qualify as a statutory process. The above method including steps of "selecting...application, retrieving a policy..., dynamically selecting one of plurality of nodes, resetting a boot image of the selected node..., associating a virtual disk image with selected the node..., and executing at least a portion of the distributed application...on the selected node" are broad enough that the claim could be completely performed mentally, verbally or without a machine nor is any transformation apparent

Amended claims 16-30 now recites "one or more computer-readable

Art Unit: 2451

tangible media embodying software, the software being operable, when executed collectively by one or more computer system, to:” The amended claims are clearly directed to software and therefore, claims 16-30 lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 USC 101.

Similarly, claims 31-45 recite a system claims of software claims 16-30 and therefore, claims 31-45 also lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 USC 101. They are clearly not a series of steps or acts to be a process nor are they a combination of chemical compounds to be a composition of matter. As such, they fail to fall within a statutory category. They are, at best, functional descriptive material *per se*.

Descriptive material can be characterized as either “functional descriptive material” or “nonfunctional descriptive material.” Both types of “descriptive material” are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive material *per se*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material, i.e., abstract ideas,

Art Unit: 2451

stored on a computer-readable medium, in a computer, or on an electromagnetic carrier signal, does not make it statutory. See *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 185-86, 209 USPQ at 8 (noting that the claims for an algorithm in *Benson* were unpatentable as abstract ideas because “[t]he sole practical application of the algorithm was in connection with the programming of a general purpose computer.”).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brownell et al. US Patent Number 7,231,430 B2 (hereinafter Brownell) and Aziz et al. US Patent Number 6,597,956 B1 (hereinafter Aziz) and further in view of Marsh et al. US Patent Number 7,055,148 B2 (hereinafter Marsh)..

As per claim 1, Brownell discloses selecting a distributed application (see column 2, lines 47-62); dynamically selecting one of a plurality of nodes(see column 2, line 47- column 3, line 8); associating a virtual disk image with the selected node based (see column 2, line 47- column 3, line 26), at least in part; and executing at least a portion of the distributed application on the selected node as reset using the virtual disk image associated with the selected node (see column 2, line 47- column 3, line 26).

However, Brownell is silent about the policy associated with the distributed application and resetting a boot image of the selected node, the boot image being compatible with the distributed application.

Marsh teaches resetting a boot image of the selected node, the boot image being compatible with the distributed application (see column 2, line 57 – column 3, line 48, column 6, line 15 – column 8, line 13, column 8, line 39 – column 10, line 30, see figures 2-4, 6);

Aziz teaches that policy associated with the distributed application for the plurality of processors and storage disks in distributed network (see column 11, lines 7-15; column 19, line 44 – column 21, line 17, see figures 14-16).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Aziz, Marsh with Brownell to provide a computer platform includes a plurality of computer processors connected to a communication network that provides an highly scalable controlling and managing storage devices coupled to storage networks or switches and provides an highly scalable computing system that supports creation of multiple segregated processing nodes whereas each processing nodes comprise a fixed storage device containing a boot image configured with an appropriate code or instruction to execute data necessary to perform firmware upgrade and installation.

As per claim 2, Brownell discloses comparing the subset of nodes with the retrieved policy (see column 2, line 47- column 3, line 26, column 8, lines 34-51

Art Unit: 2451

locally configured IP address containing MAC address); and Marsh teaches selecting one of a plurality of compatible boot images based on the comparison(see column 2, line 57 – column 3, line 48, column 6, line 15 – column 8, line 13, column 8, line 39 – column 10, line 30, see figures 2-4, 6).

As per claim 3, Brownell discloses determining a count of nodes in the subset (see column 2, line 47- column 3, line 26, column 8, lines 34-51, column 14, lines 39-49); and Marsh teaches selecting the boot image based on a link in the policy and the count of nodes (see column 2, line 57 – column 3, line 48, column 6, line 15 – column 8, line 13, column 8, line 39 – column 10, line 30, see figures 2-4, 6).

As per claim 4, Marsh teaches the subset of nodes associated with one of the plurality of compatible boot images (see column 2, line 57 – column 3, line 48, column 6, line 15 – column 8, line 13, column 8, line 39 – column 10, line 30, see figures 2-4, 6).

As per claim 5, Brownell discloses determining if one or more of the plurality of nodes is unutilized by a second distributed application (see column 7,line 29 – column 8, line 51; internal nodes utilization is unavailable to external node); and in response to at least one of the nodes being unutilized, selecting one of the unutilized nodes(see column 7,line 29 – column 8, line 51).

As per claim 6, Brownell compatibility of the selected node with the selected distributed application (see column 7,line 29 – column 8, line 51) and



Art Unit: 2451

Aziz teaches the policy (see column 11, lines 7-15; column 19, line 44 – column 21, line 17).

As per claim 7, Marsh teaches automatically shutting down the selected node (see column 2, line 57 – column 3, line 48, column 6, line 15 – column 8, line 13, column 8, line 39 – column 10, line 30, see figures 2-4, 6); resetting the boot image of the selected node (see column 2, line 57 – column 3, line 48, column 6, line 15 – column 8, line 13, column 8, line 39 – column 10, line 30, see figures 2-4, 6); and restarting the selected node using the reset boot image (see column 2, line 57 – column 3, line 48, column 6, line 15 – column 8, line 13, column 8, line 39 – column 10, line 30, see figures 2-4, 6).

As per claim 8, Brownell discloses terminating any processes associated with the second distributed application prior to shutting down the node (see column 2, line 47- column 3, line 26, column 6, lines 18-35, column 9, line 54 – column 10, line 28 ).

As per claim 9, Marsh teaches a plurality of links to boot images, each link associated with one of a count of nodes compatible with the distributed application (see column 2, line 57 – column 3, line 48, column 6, line 15 – column 8, line 13, column 8, line 39 – column 10, line 30, see figures 2-4, 6).

As per claim 10, Brownell discloses one or more parameters for determining the timing of the selection of the node (column 27, lines 30-32) .

As per claim 11, Brownell discloses a remote boot image stored in a Storage Area Network (SAN) (column 2, line 45 – column 3, line 26).

Art Unit: 2451

As per claim 12, Marsh teaches the node associated with a first boot image prior to the reset and associated with a second boot image from the reset, the first and second boot image differing in at least one of the following characteristics: operating system; system configuration and distributed application parameters (see column 2, line 57 – column 3, line 48, column 6, line 15 – column 8, line 13, column 8, line 39 – column 10, line 30, see figures 2-4, 6).

As per claim 13, Brownell discloses determining that one of the plurality of nodes failed, the failed node executing at least a portion of the selected distributed application (see column 2, line 47- column 3, line 26, column 6, lines 18-35, column 9, line 54 – column 10, line 28); and wherein selecting one of the plurality of nodes comprises selecting one of the remaining nodes in response to the failure (see column 2, line 47- column 3, line 26, column 6, lines 18-35, column 9, line 54 – column 10, line 28).

As per claim 14, Brownell discloses the same processor architecture (column 5, lines 29-34).

As per claim 15, Brownell discloses selecting one of the plurality of nodes at a predetermined time column 27, lines 30-32).

As per claims 16-30 and 31-45, they do not teach or further define over the limitation as recited in claims 1-15, Brownell discloses therefore, claims 16-45 are rejected under same scope as discussed in claims 1-15, supra.

### **Conclusion**

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See accompanying PTO 892 form.

a. Merging Scalable Nodes into Single-Partition Merged System Using Service Processors of Nodes by Zaharias US Patent Number 7,379,983 B2.

b. Mechanism for Controlling Boot Decisions from a Network Policy Directory Based on Client Profile Information by Backman et al. US Patent Number 7,127,597 B2.

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

### **Contact Information**

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Saket K. Daftuar whose telephone number is 571-272-8363. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm M-W.

Art Unit: 2451

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. K. D./

Examiner, Art Unit 2451

/John Follansbee/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2451